

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-30 are rejected. Claims 1, 14, 22 and 27 are amended herein. Reconsideration of the Application and Claims is respectfully requested.

101 Rejections

Claims 1-13 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is contended to be directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully submit that the rejection by the Examiner of Claims 1-13 and 22-26 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter is improper. In particular, contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, the presentation of information to a user or the occurrence of a physical transformation outside of a computer is not the measure of whether a claim should be rejected under 35 USC 101. The proper standard is whether the method as claimed produces a “concrete, tangible and useful result.” Applicant respectfully submits that performing reliability determinations with regard to electronic components are concrete, tangible and useful. Consequently, as the Claims are in fact directed to statutory subject matter as is indicated by the above discussion, Applicant respectfully request a withdrawal of the 35 USC 101 rejection of Claims 1-13 and 22-26.

103 Rejections

Claims 1, 4-22 and 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Quist et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,018). The Applicant have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as set forth in Claims 1, 4-22 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Quist et al.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which is drawn to an electronic component reliability determination method. Claim 1 is reproduced below in its entirety for convenience of the Examiner.

1. An electronic component reliability determination method comprising:
 - executing an initialization process;
 - implementing a field condition determination process;
 - performing a field condition reliability analysis process for an operational parameter of said electronic component; and
 - performing a reliability information management process.

Claims 14, 22 and 27 contain limitations similar to those of Claim 1. Claims 4-13, 15-21, 24-26 and 28-30 depend from Claims 1, 14, 22 and 27 respectively and recite further limitations of embodiments of the present invention.

Quist et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiment of the claimed invention as set forth in claim 1. Quist et al. is deficient as Quist et al. does not teach each of the limitations of the Claim 1 as is required to establish a *prima facie* case for obviousness or anticipation of the embodiment of the invention set forth in this Claim. In particular, Quist et al. does not teach or suggest “implementing a field condition reliability analysis process for an operational parameter” as is set forth in Claim 1.

Quist et al. discloses a distributed diagnostic system that is dissimilar to the system that is set forth in Claim 1. Quist et al. discloses that local monitoring devices collect local information related to various machines monitored by the diagnostic system and process the local information according to predefined diagnostic parameters for diagnostic purposes. Applicant respectfully submit that the focus of the Quist et al. reference is diagnostics as opposed to reliability determinations for operational parameters as set forth in Claim 1. It should be appreciated that Applicant disclose that reliability determinations are used to provide a basis for predicting prospective performance while the diagnostics disclosed by Quist et al. provide determinations (diagnoses) related to conditions that are already present. Applicant respectfully submit that determining the reliability of an operational parameter to

predict prospective performance and diagnosing conditions that are already present are distinct functionalities that cannot reasonably be equated.

Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere in the Quist et al. reference is implementing a field condition reliability analysis process for an operational parameter of an electronic component taught or suggested. Consequently, Quist et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiment of the claimed invention as set forth in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Quist et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 2-13 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 14-21 dependent on Claim 13, Claims 23-26 dependent on Claim 22 and Claims 28-30 dependent on Claim 28 and that these Claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as they are dependent on an allowable base claim.

103 Rejection

Claims 3 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quist et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,018) in view of Chess et al.. The Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that Quist et al. in view of Chess et al. does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the claimed invention as set forth in Claims 3 and 23. Quist et al. does not teach each of the limitations of Claims 1 and 14 (upon which Claim 3 and 23 depend respectively) as is required to establish a *prima facie* case for either obviousness or anticipation and Chess does not remedy the deficiencies of Quist et al. In particular, Quist et al. does not teach or suggest “implementing a field condition reliability analysis process for an operational parameter of said electronic component” as is set forth in Claim 1 (as was discussed above). And, Chess does not teach this limitation to remedy the deficiencies of Quist et al.

As discussed above, Quist et al. discloses a distributed diagnostic system that is dissimilar to the system that is set forth in Claims 1 and 14. Quist et al. discloses that local monitoring devices collect local information concerning various machines monitored by the

diagnostic system and process the local information according to predefined diagnostic parameters for diagnostic purposes. Applicant respectfully submits that the focus of the Quist et al. reference is diagnostics as opposed to reliability determinations for operational parameters of electronic components as set forth in Claims 1 and 14. It should be appreciated that Applicant discloses that reliability determinations are used to provide a basis for predicting prospective performance while the diagnostics disclosed by Quist et al. provide determinations (diagnoses) concerning conditions that are already present. Applicant respectfully submits that determining the reliability of an operational parameter to predict prospective performance and diagnosing conditions that are already present are distinct functionalities that cannot reasonably be equated.

As alluded to above Chess does not teach or suggest a modification of Quist et al. that would remedy the deficiencies of Chess outlined above. In particular, Chess does not teach or suggest “implementing a field condition reliability analysis process for an operational parameter of said electronic component” as is set forth in Claim 1 (as was discussed above). Chess discloses a system and method for protecting the integrity of alterable ROM using a digital signature. It should be appreciated that Chess is concerned with verifying the integrity of a computer system’s BIOS program to prevent malicious alteration thereof. Chess is not concerned with determining reliability which is a very different operational dimension. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that equating reliability and integrity as a basis for establishing a *prima facie* case as is done in the outstanding Office Action is not proper. Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere in the Chess reference is implementing a field condition reliability analysis process for an operational parameter of an electronic component taught or suggested. Consequently, Quist et al. in view of Chess does not teach or suggest the embodiments of the claimed invention as set forth in Claims 3 and 23 (that depend upon Claims 1 and 14 respectively).

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 11/1, 2006


Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No. 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060